believe that the standpoint of the author and the commentator of the aphorisms is the same. For instance, when the author of the Sutras speaks of Brahman as the Creator/Preserver and Destroyer of the world, as a Being of infinite knowledge, power and goodness, he does not give so much as a hint that he says all this only from the popular or *vyavaharika* point of view, and that there is a higher standpoint from which all this is seen to be false. Again, when the author of the Sutras describes the gradual evolution of the world, he never suggests that the process described by him is a false one, one that is found to be imaginary as soon as we know the sole and absolute unity and reality of Brahman. The author of the Brahma Sutras is indeed a Monist, affirming, in unequivocal terms, the essential unity of the world and the individual soul with Brahman, and this affords Sankara an opportunity for representing rather misrepresenting him as holding the unreality of creation; but this is to beg the whole question at issue from the very beginning,—to assume what has to be proved,—that unity is inconsistent with diversity and

difference. There can be absolutely no doubt, as observed by Tattwabhushan, that the author of the Brahma Sutras is of the opposite view, is a believer in both unity and difference, speaks of the creation and diversity of the world of matter and mind when emphasising the element of difference in it, and of its identity with the one only real Brahman when intending to bring into prominence the essential unity of the universe.

Tattwabhushan thinks and rightly too that the attempt of Sankara to establish a system of Absolute Monism on the denial of reality to the phenomenal world and to the individual soul is futile and unconvincing. The absolute monism of the Vedanta advocated by' the Rishis Uddalaka Aruni, Yajnavalkya, Pippalada, Angirasa, Maundukya, is true and rational enough without the unreliable and